

REMARKS

Reconsideration of this application as amended is respectfully requested.

Claims 1 and 13 have been amended.

Claims 1, 4 – 9, 13, 16, and 17 are presented for examination.

Applicants reserve all rights under the Doctrine of Equivalents.

Claims 1, 4 – 9, 13, 16, and 17 stand rejected.

Claim 1 has been amended to better define the invention. Claim 13 has been amended to depend from claim 1. Support for the amendments of claims 1 and 13 are found in the specification as originally filed. It is respectfully submitted that the amendments do not add new matter.

Claims Rejections – 35 U.S.C. §103

In Paragraphs 3 - 11 of the Office Action, the Examiner has rejected claims 1, 4 – 6, 13, 16, and 17 under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over Grady, U.S. Publication No. 2004/0058649 ("Grady"), in view of Fadell et al., U.S. Publication No. 2005/0224638 A1 with evidence from U.S. Publication No. 2003/0158737 A1 of Csicsatka ("Csicsatka"), further in view of Thielen, U.S. Publication No. 2004/0117442 ("Thielen"), and further in view of Ogai, U.S. Publication No. 2003/0177073 A1 ("Ogai").

The prior art of Thielen and Grady was discussed in applicants' responses filed on November 24, 2008, May 18, 2009, and December 14, 2009. The prior art of Fadell and Csicsatka was discussed in applicants' response filed on December 14, 2009.

Ogai describes embedding IDs of designated media players in purchased content, to limit playback of the content to the designated players (Ogai/ paragraph [0009]).

With respect to the rejection of independent claim 1, applicants respectfully submit that there is no motivation for combining Ogai with Grady, with Fadell, or with Thielen.
Applicants respectfully submit that Grady, Fadell, and Thielen relate to versatility of content

players. In distinction, Ogai relates to copy permission of purchased content, and does not relate to versatility of a content player. Whereas Grady, Fadell, and Thielen disclose enhanced functions that a content player can perform, Ogai discloses permitting purchased content to be played on pre-designated players. It is only the result of impermissible hindsight, based on applicants' disclosure, that the Examiner has combined Ogai with the other cited prior art.

Applicants note that although Thielen (paragraphs 149 – 169) discloses digital right management data, Thielen is silent on the nature of the rights. Nevertheless, even if Thielen and Ogai were combined on this basis, Thielen teaches away from transmitting a player ID as RDS text to an FM radio; specifically, Thielen (paragraph 129, cited by the Examiner on page 5 of the Office Action) discloses transmitting “text associated with content,” whereas a player ID is not associated with content.

Applicants respectfully submit that the limitation in claim 1 of

“a second transfer socket ... through which the meta-data is transferred to the radio transmitter for transmission by the radio transmitter as RDS data, wherein the meta-data comprises a name and an identifier for the hand-held music player”

is neither shown nor suggested in Grady, Fadell, Csicsatka, Thielen, or Ogai.

Given that claims **4-6, 13, 16, and 17** depend from claim 1 (directly or indirectly) and include additional features, applicants respectfully submit that claims **4-6, 13, 16, and 17** are not rendered obvious by Grady, Fadell, Csicatka, Thielen, and Ogai.

In Paragraphs 12 – 14 of the Office Action, the Examiner has rejected claims 7 and 8 under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over Grady, Fadell, Thielin and Ogai, with evidence from Csicsatka, and further in view of admitted prior art or regarding USB 1.1 and 2.0.

Applicants respectfully submit that the admitted prior art regarding USB 1.1. and 2.0 does not cure the deficiency of no motivation to combine Ogai with Grady, with Fadell, or with Thielen.

Given that claims 7 and 8 depend indirectly from claim 1 and include additional features, applicants respectfully submit that claims 7 and 8 are not rendered obvious by Grady, Fadell, Csicsatka, Thielen, Ogai, and the admitted prior art.

In Paragraphs 15 and 16 of the Office Action, the Examiner has rejected claim 9 under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over Grady, Fadell, Thielen, and Ogai, with evidence from Csicsatka, and further in view of Matsuda et al., U.S. Patent No. 6,774,604 ("Matsuda").

The prior art of Matsuda was discussed in applicants' responses filed on November 24, 2008 and May 18, 2009. Matsuda describes a power supply and battery charging for a host device connected to a slave device, the devices having USB interfaces. Applicants respectfully submit that Matsuda does not cure the deficiency of no motivation to combine Ogai with Grady, with Fadell, or with Thielen.

Because claim 9 depends indirectly from claim 1 and includes an additional feature, applicants respectfully submit that claim 9 is not rendered obvious by Grady, Fadell, Csicsatka, Thielen, Ogai, and Matsuda.

For the foregoing reasons, applicants respectfully submit that the rejections and objections have been overcome.

Pursuant to 37 C.F.R. § 1.136(a)(3), applicants hereby request and authorize the U.S. Patent and Trademark Office to (1) treat any concurrent or future reply that requires a petition for extension of time as incorporating a petition for extension of time for the appropriate length of time and (2) charge all required fees, including extension of time fees and fees under 37 C.F.R. § 1.16 and § 1.17, to Deposit Account No. 02-2666.

Respectfully submitted,

BLAKELY, SOKOLOFF, TAYLOR & ZAFMAN LLP

Date: November 22, 2010



Lester J. Vincent
Reg. No. 31,460

1279 Oakmead Parkway
Sunnyvale, CA 94085-4040
(408) 720-8300
Customer No. 92129